



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,729	10/27/2000	Brandon Camp	SprintIDF1398(4000-00700)	6172
28003	7590	02/27/2007		
SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			EXAMINER TANG, KENNETH	
			ART UNIT 2195	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/698,729

Applicant(s)

CAMP ET AL.

Examiner

Kenneth Tang

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Pre-Appeal Brief Decision to Reopen Prosecution on 12/19/06. Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejections.
2. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, "an application processing the batch job" (last line) is indefinite. According to Applicant's definition in the Specification, an application is a batch job. Therefore, the limitation of an application processing the application is an unclear one:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2195

3. Claims 1-3 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li (US 6,519,594 B1).

4. As to claim 1, Li teaches a process for processing a batch job (program or Application, as defined in Specification, page 1 – taught in Li, col. 4, lines 48-57, etc.), comprising:

wrapping (Wrapper, Dispatcher, API and Java Native Interface is used in the communication) (col. 6, lines 33-50) the batch job to create an application programming interface (API) for communication with a batch framework (JavaLayer Framework) (col. 6, lines 32-58, col. 7, lines 60-65, col. 9, lines 5-15), the batch framework (Java Layer framework) comprising a batch dispatcher class (Dispatcher class 145), and the batch dispatcher class further comprising a method to execute the batch job (applications) (col. 11, lines 1-10 and 40-57); and

5. invoking the batch framework according to a predetermined schedule via execution of a command line parameter (col. 7, lines 42-65, col. 5, lines 64-67 through col. 6, lines 1-2), wherein the method provides for efficient reuse of programming code and platform independence (Java) by encapsulating (from the wrapping of the Wrapper) the batch job and providing a uniform application programming interface for an application processing the batch job according to the method (col. 6, lines 17-50, col. 1, lines 39-51, col. 3, lines 1-11, col. 7, lines 60-65, col. 9, lines 5-15).

6. As to claim 2, Li teaches the process of claim 1 wherein the batch job resides locally with the batch framework (JavaLayer 160 allows various coexisting applications to share resource) (col. 4, lines 40-45).

Art Unit: 2195

7. As to claim 3, Li teaches the process of claim 1 wherein the batch job resides remotely from the batch framework (col. 6, lines 6-8, col. 4, lines 20-23).

8. As to claim 19, Li teaches a batch framework that is a JAVA framework involving classes and an API (col. 9, lines 5-15, col. 7, lines 1-12).

9. As to claim 20, Li teaches wherein the application programming interface for communication with the batch framework is a Java application programming interface (col. 14, lines 61-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 4-6 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Li (US 6,519,594 B1).

11. As to claims 4-6, Li teaches the process of claim 1 wherein the batch framework is invoked by a scheduler (col. 7, lines 42-50). Li is silent that there is a service performed in relation to the scheduler. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have known to use the

Art Unit: 2195

scheduler in providing a service because it would benefit it would improve task management of the service, if the scheduler is used.

12. As to claim 21, Li teaches wherein the command line parameter comprises a class name (col. 10, lines 51-59). Li is silent in having a method name and one or more method parameters in the command line parameter. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a method name and one or more method parameters in the command line parameter because the method name and parameters are included in the class and are needed in order to specifically identify contents in the class.

13. **Claims 7-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (US 6,519,594 B1) in view of Swartz et al. (hereinafter Swartz) (US 6,625,651 B1).**

14. As to claims 7-8, Li is silent in teaching the process wherein the scheduling service is AutoSys. However, Swartz discloses processing a batch job using Autosys (*col. 20, lines 56-62*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the use of Autosys to the invention of Li because Autosys will provide for job management for the scheduling.

15. As to claim 9, Swartz teaches the process of claim 8 wherein the command line parameter is a Unix shell script (*col. 4, line 52*).

16. As to claim 10, Swartz teaches the process of claim 8 wherein the command line parameter is a Windows NT batch file (*col. 4, line 50*).
17. As to claims 11-12, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 7-8.
18. As to claim 13, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claim 9.
19. As to claim 14, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claim 10.
20. As to claims 15-16, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 7-8.
21. As to claim 17, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claim 9.
- 22.
23. As to claim 18, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claim 10.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejections.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kt
2/8/07


MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER